

DE020010
PATENT

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

Claim 12 was rejected as anticipated by Nilssen. The Examiner relies upon the following text from column 4 of the Nilssen patent.

"The full-bridge inverter of FIG. 1 actually consists of two half-bridge inverters, either of which can be made to operate independently of the other, as long as the other is maintained in a non-operative state. When both half-bridge inverters oscillate, they are bound by their common feedback current to operate in synchronism and out-of-phase with one another. If required, some other load may be connected between the JXb/JC junctions--in direct correspondence with the load (namely power transformer PT) connected between the JXa/JC junctions."

The paragraph following the above-quoted paragraph is also relevant.

"In other words, the JC junction constitutes a common output terminal for the two half-bridge inverters. Thus, the output from the one half-bridge inverter is from junction JXa with respect to the common terminal JC; and the output from the other half-bridge inverter is from junction JXb with respect to the same common terminal JC."

In other words, there are **two** outputs. A first output includes terminals JC and JXa. The second output includes JC and JXb. The half bridges disclosed in the Nilssen patent may operate "independently" but only if the outputs are referenced to terminal JC. Lamp FL is coupled between terminals JXa and JXb. If transistors Qb1 and Qb2 (the right hand half bridge) do not operate, then the lamp will not light. Claim 12 recites "a circuit for operating a high pressure lamp." It is respectfully submitted that there is no anticipation.

In other words, there is no disclosure in the patent that the circuit can drive lamp FL and operate "independently," i.e. with only one half bridge functioning. Nor could there be such disclosure. The circuit shown in the patent figure does not support such an idea because lamp FL is coupled between terminals JXa and JXb. Therefore, there is no anticipation of claim 12. This interpretation is consistent with the quoted statement that "*When both half-bridge inverters oscillate, they are bound by their common feedback current to operate in synchronism and out-of-phase with one another.*" It is respectfully submitted that the text of the Nilssen

DE020010
PATENT

patent is directly contrary to the Examiner's interpretation of the patent disclosure. Both half bridges must operate, dependently, to drive lamp FL.

Claim 12 recites a filter and a resonant circuit and that the lamp is connected between the filter and the resonant circuit. None of this is mentioned in the Examiner's statement in support of the rejection. It is therefore respectfully submitted that, because of the incomplete analysis, the Examiner has failed to provide a prima facie case of anticipation.

The rejections made in paragraphs 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Office Action dated December 7, 2005, are all predicated upon the Nilssen patent and are in error for the reasons given above. There is also a serious question of the basis for the combinations made with the additional prior art relied upon.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-14 are in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul F. Wille

Reg. No. 25,274

Attorney for Applicants

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, N.Y. 10510-8001
(914) 333-9634